

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 226 926

RC 013 903

AUTHOR Valdez, Armando
TITLE Summary Findings for Summer 1980 Mini-Corps Outdoor Education Program.
INSTITUTION California Mini Corps, Oroville.
SPONS AGENCY California State Dept. of Education, Sacramento.
Bureau of Community Services and Migrant Education.
PUB DATE 80
NOTE 30p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Achievement; Comparative Analysis; Elementary Education; Mastery Tests; *Migrant Education; *Outdoor Education; *Program Effectiveness; Spanish Speaking; Teacher Effectiveness; *Teacher Evaluation; Teacher Supervision; Test Construction

ABSTRACT

The evaluation aimed to develop and field test measurement instruments to assess student achievement and program performance. The former evaluation goal was designated greater priority during the 1980 summer term, with the intent of shifting priority to program performance the next year. A mastery test, designed to assess student performance, was field tested at six California Mini-Corps Outdoor Education camps operated during the summer. The field test was conducted to answer three basic questions: Can the test be administered in 20 minutes? Do test items appropriately measure student knowledge of specified concepts and terms? How do outdoor education students perform on the mastery test compared to similar students not participating in the outdoor education program? The test was administered to 837 migrant students receiving camp experience and to 249 students attending the same feeder elementary schools but receiving no camp experience. Results demonstrated significantly higher scoring levels for students receiving camp experience. Related results demonstrated lower average scores for Spanish speaking students even though the tests were administered in Spanish versions for them. Supervisor ratings of teacher assistant performance (7 team leaders rating 66 teacher assistants) tended to be high and at levels generally expected for Mini-Corps assistants. (NQA)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED226926

SUMMARY FINDINGS FOR SUMMER 1980
MINI-CORPS OUTDOOR EDUCATION PROGRAM

By

Armando Valdez, Ph. D.
External Evaluator
San Jose, CA

California Mini Corps
Oroville, CA

A program of the California State Dept. of Education, Sacramento. Bureau
of Community Services and Migrant Education.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Herbert C. White

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
☒ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
position or policy.

RC013903

SUMMARY FINDINGS FOR SUMMER 1980
MINI-CORPS OUTDOOR EDUCATION PROGRAM

- 1.0 For several years, Mini-Corps has attempted to measure short term pupil mastery of concepts and terms presumably acquired through exposure to an "Outdoor Biology Instructional Strategy" (OBIS) - a curriculum used in our Outdoor Education Camp Programs. This year, the external evaluator developed tests for this purpose (2 forms) which were administered to 837 pupils receiving camp experience and a matched sample (comparison group) of 249 pupils attending the same feeder elementary schools but who received no camp experience.

The results demonstrated significantly higher scoring levels for pupils receiving camp experience (OBIS curriculum) versus those not attending camp. However, the evaluator noted that "these data are speculative, in the absence of a standardized curriculum...across all camps."

Related results demonstrated lower average scores for Spanish speaking pupils even though the tests were administered in Spanish versions for them. However, the Spanish dominant group was proportionately less than expected (less than 30% of the pupils). Complete findings follow. The mastery tests, of course, will not be included since reuse is anticipated.

- 2.0 Approximately 3200 migrant pupils, elementary and secondary levels, were served. Seven Outdoor Education teams, using 15 camp sites, were used throughout California ranging from high desert to Sierra natural environments. 66 Mini-Corps teacher assistants served these programs.
- 3.0 Supervisor ratings of teacher assistant performance (7 team leaders rating 66 teacher assistants) tended to be high and at levels generally expected for Mini-Corps assistants. Comparative weaknesses were noted in the following activities: "Ability to Manage and Control Small Groups of Children" (22% of assistants below standard); and, "Ability to Diagnose Learning Needs of Pupils" (25% of assistants below standard). These factors were probably adversely affected by having to instruct in an outdoor setting. 80% of the group of teacher assistants were rated as "outstanding" - a high level by Mini-Corps standards.
- 4.0 The average ratings for team leader or supervising performance was found to be lower than Mini-Corps expected standards largely because one supervisor (of seven) received unusually low ratings.

The average profile for team leaders is included in the data as well as the (anonymous) ratings for the low rated team leader for comparison.

Comparative weaknesses in supervisor ratings were noted in inservice training areas; for example, they may "attempt to cover too much material... or they may not have organized material effectively." However, we would expect on-site supervision to be adequate since team leaders served right at the camps; all teacher assistants were supervised at least once a week (see Part 5.0 item).

5.0 Teacher assistants' ratings of the Outdoor Education Program demonstrated excellent satisfaction with the overall quality of their Outdoor Education experience (77%). Also, overall supervision was good to excellent (31% good, 58% excellent). Problem areas included: "Communications with State-wide Mini-Corps Headquarters" (60% rating below standard); and, "Communications with Migrant Education Regional Personnel" (55% rating below standard). Obviously, improvement is needed in communications with regional personnel on a priority basis since the children themselves are drawn from Migrant Education regular programs.

General recommendations for program improvement from teacher assistants included:

- Improvement of check disbursement
- Improvement of communications with Migrant Education personnel
- Preservice training with use of the OBIS curriculum before summer camps. Also, the curriculum should be standardized so that pupils receive reasonably equivalent materials. Some pupils are beginning to react negatively to repetitious curriculum; graded curriculum would answer this problem.
- Teacher assistants feel that more parents and outside visitors such as, regional personnel, and teachers should be brought up to observe the camp programs.
- Teacher assistants complained regularly about the timely delivery of teaching materials to the camps. Perhaps a liaison person needs to be retained.

PART 1.0

CALIFORNIA MINI-CORPS
OUTDOOR EDUCATION PROGRAM EVALUATION
SUMMER 1980

BY ARMANDO VALDEZ, Ph.D., EXTERNAL EVALUATOR

This report presents the findings of pilot testing of the Outdoor Education Program conducted during the summer 1980 term. This evaluation represents the first phase of a planned two year effort to develop appropriate and cost-effective measurement procedures for the summer program.

The goals of this evaluation effort were to develop and field test measurement instruments to assess (a) student achievement and (b) program performance. After careful assessment of the structure and goals of the Outdoor Education instructional component, a mastery test was developed to assess program performance. The former evaluation goal was designated greater priority during the 1980 summer term, with the intent of shifting priority to program performance the next year.

Instrument Development

The evaluation instruments designed through this effort are confidential and reserved for reuse. The mastery test designed to assess student performance was field tested at six (6) of the California Mini-Corps Outdoor Education camps operated during the Summer 1980 terms. The specifications for the design of the mastery test, were formulated in consultation with the California Mini-Corps Associate Director, Isidro Tarango, who directs the Outdoor Education Summer Program. These specifications are attached as Appendix B of this report. On the basis of this experience and the test results, a revised version of the mastery test was developed.

The process evaluation instrument designed to assess program performance was pilot tested late into the term. The approach to developing this instrument was for the evaluation to conduct site visits to several of the camp sites for the purpose of observing program operation first hand. These observations served to guide the development of an instrument designed to yield valuable data for a formative evaluation of program operations. A systematic field test is scheduled to occur during the 1981 summer term. The balance of this report, thus, discusses the findings of the field test for the mastery test.

Field Test

The field test of the student performance instrument was conducted to answer three basic questions:

1. Can the test be administered in twenty (20) minutes?
2. Do the test items appropriately measure student knowledge of specified concepts and terms instructed?
3. How do the outdoor education students perform on the mastery test compared to similar students that have not participated in the outdoor education program?

This section of the report discusses the findings of the field test as they pertain to these three questions.

Administration Time

When proper test administration procedures were followed, the mastery test was administered in an average time of twenty minutes. In cases where the recommended procedures were not followed, testing time ranged from

twenty-five to forty minutes.

These data are based on the reports of team leaders and Mini-Corpsmen at the Outdoor Education camps. As discussed later, the mastery test was also administered to a comparison group of students in Region IV.

In this situation, a total of twelve Mini-Corpsmen were thoroughly trained as test proctors and carefully monitored. Administration of the mastery test under classroom conditions averaged eighteen minutes.

The expectation of a twenty minute test administration time was met. It was when the test proctors were not properly instructed, or when the recommended procedure of testing students in one language only, rather than both concurrently, was not observed that the administration time exceeded the twenty minute average.

There were several test administration problems at the camps that need to be addressed in the future to achieve the expected average test administration time. At some camp sites, proctors did not have pencils available to distribute to the students for taking the mastery test. In these cases, color crayons were shared by students while taking the test. In other cases, students did not have adequate writing surfaces. These factors may not only lengthen the time required to complete the test but may affect the student's interest and motivation levels.

Test Content

The mastery test was based on the terms and concepts presented in the OBIS instructional units used by the Outdoor Education Program. Only those terms and concepts that are common to all the camp sites were incorporated into the test. As a consequence, the test was, by design, measuring only a limited range of the total instructional program. This sampling characteristic of the mastery test created a need for a well-administered program of standardized

instruction based on the OBIS program at all the Outdoor Education Camps. This standardization is a prerequisite to any program-wide testing. In the absence of such standardization, the data cannot be interpreted to reflect program-wide student performance. At the same time, this goal of program-wide data on student performance must recognize the vast diversity in other aspects of the camps' instructional program.

To determine the appropriateness of the items used in the mastery test, an item-analysis of instrument was conducted for three camps. Data from Valley of the Moon, Camp Edwards and Camp Cuyamaca were selected for this item analysis because they represented the highest, median and lowest scoring camps, program-wide item analysis, will indicate the extent to which each test item measures student knowledge among students of different measured achievement levels. Table 1 presents the results of this item analysis.

As Table 1 illustrates, the majority of the test items differentiate between the high, medium and low achievement groups. The exceptions to this are Section II items 1, 3 and 4. The median group scored better than or equal to the high group; the low group scored consistently lower on these items. These items tested the concepts: edible plants, food chain and habitat, respectively. The latter two concepts are tested in other items also where this pattern did not occur. This suggests that the response mode, fill in the blank, was what accounted for the discrepancies. A closer review of this section indicates that only one of the five items in this section differentiated well. This lends credence to the observation that the response mode proved to be too difficult for the students. Although the data does not indicate pronounced floor effects, it seems advisable to delete this section in the revised version

TABLE 1
ITEM ANALYSIS OF MASTERY TEST
(REPORTED BY ERROR-RATE BY CAMPSITE)

SECTION & RESPONSE MODE	ITEM NO. CONCEPT TESTED	NO. & PERCENT OF INCORRECT RESPONSES		
		Valley of Moon	Edwards	Cuyamaca
		N=75 $\bar{x}$ =11.6	N=34 $\bar{x}$ =8.6	N=19 $\bar{x}$ =4.2
Section I : IDENTIFY & CIRCLE CORRECT OPTION				
	1. predators	14 (19%)	10 (29%)	15 (79%)
	2. predatory devices	22 (29%)	12 (35%)	10 (53%)
	3. litter critters	33 (44%)	16 (47%)	16 (84%)
	4. prey	29 (39%)	11 (32%)	10 (53%)
	5. food chains	29 (39%)	13 (38%)	15 (79%)
	6. seed dispersal	57 (76%)	28 (82%)	13 (95%)
	7. litter critters	55 (73%)	30 (88%)	17 (90%)
	8. reptiles	22 (29%)	14 (41%)	17 (90%)
	9. seed dispersal	35 (47%)	17 (50%)	15 (79%)
	10. compass	28 (37%)	28 (82%)	17 (90%)
Section II : MATCH CORRECT TERM TO DEFINITION				
	1. habitat	30 (40%)	13 (38%)	13 (68%)
	2. camouflage	20 (27%)	17 (50%)	11 (58%)
	3. reptiles	22 (29%)	13 (38%)	13 (68%)
	4. erosion	35 (47%)	17 (50%)	13 (68%)
	5. scavenger	35 (47%)	17 (50%)	15 (79%)
SECTION III : FILL IN BLANK FROM LIST OF POSSIBLE RESPONSES				
	1. edible plants	54 (73%)	2 (6%)	17 (90%)
	2. predators	45 (60%)	21 (62%)	16 (84%)
	3. food chain	55 (73%)	25 (73%)	18 (95%)
	4. habitat	34 (45%)	8 (23%)	15 (79%)
	5. food chain	33 (44%)	20 (59%)	18 (95%)
TOTAL PERCENTAGE WRONG:		46%	49%	79%

of the mastery test.

Sections I and II proved to be generally stable and differentiate adequately. There are three exceptions to this pattern. Items 4 and 5 in Section I indicate that the median group scored a few percentage points higher than the high group. This is also the case for item 1 of Section II. However, since the remaining items in both of these sections differentiate quite well, it is probably that these items failed to differentiate levels of student knowledge. It is also probable that the test results for these items merely reflect more adequate instruction at the mid-range campsites. In fact, without a carefully controlled standardized instructional program at all campsites, the anomalies in the data pattern may actually reflect differences of emphasis in instruction rather than the measurement qualities of the test items.

Achievement Baseline

A major issue that needs to be addressed in the design of the mastery test was the extent to which it actually measured short-term learning derived from campsite instruction as opposed to learning due to regular classroom instruction received by the migrant education students in their regular course of schooling. It was necessary to establish a baseline level of knowledge against which to compare the achievement of Outdoor Education students. A testing program of educationally and socio-culturally comparable students was undertaken. A total of 249 migrant education students in Region IV who are eligible for the Summer Outdoor education program but who had not attended prior to the testing, were given the mastery test. For logistical and

measurement reasons, it was decided to administer the test to all students in attendance in those classrooms slated for testing. This procedure yielded interesting data, shown in Table 2.

TABLE 2
COMPARISON GROUP PERFORMANCE
(REPORTED BY SCHOOL AND PRIOR CAMP ATTENDANCE)

SCHOOL	<u>STUDENT PERFORMANCE</u>					
	<u>ATTENDED CAMP</u>			<u>NO CAMP</u>		
	N	Range	$\bar{x}$	N	Range	$\bar{x}$
Calowa Elementary	33	4-17	10.3	28	2-17	5.9
Burroughs Elementary	0	0	0	25	1-11	4.8
Washington School (Selma)	4	3-11	7.8	57	0-15	6.3
Orolma School	8	1-13	8.8	13	3-8	2.0
Winchell Elementary	20	2-14	6.1	32	0-14	6.6
Lincoln Elementary	0	0	0	25	1-14	5.7
Westside Elementary	13	3-18	9.5	69	1-16	7.1
TOTALS	78	1-18	8.8	249	0-17	6.1

Of the total 327 students that were tested, 78 had attended the Summer '80 Outdoor Education camps. Thus, although the amount of students in these two groups are disparate, the breakdown by school site makes it clear that the group means reflect actual measured differences in achievement between

the students that had attended the Outdoor Education camps and those that had not. The former group had a group mean of 6.1 compared to 8.8 for the latter.

Table 3 lends further support to this interpretation. As this table illustrates, the numbers of students tested for each condition was large enough to permit interpretation of the data at an acceptable confidence level. These data indicate a group mean of 8.2 for students tested at the Outdoor Education camps compared to 6.1 for the comparison group students who did not attend the camps.

TABLE 3
MASTERY TEST ACHIEVEMENT
CAMP VERSUS COMPARISON GROUP PERFORMANCE

CONDITION	N	RANGE	$\bar{x}$
Camp	837	0 - 19	8.2
Comparison (No-Camp) Only	249	0 - 17	6.1

Therefore, the data in Table 2 and 3 suggest that the higher achievement levels of the Outdoor Education students is attributable to the instructional program at the campsites.

Mastery Test Results

A major aspect of the field test was the assessment of student achievement levels on the mastery test. Table 4 reports these data. The achievement levels vary considerably across camps and within camps in most cases. One number of students tested also varied considerably. They varied from a low of 19 at Camp Cuyamaca on August 22 to a high of 108 at the Sonora Regional Learning Center on June 27.

The range of individual scores also varied greatly at each camp. Students scoring zero or one point was not uncommon. Scores at Valley of the Moon were unique in that no student scored below 2 raw points. The range of scores at Camp Cuyamaca on August 22 and June 22, and at Camp Wastahi on July 11 and July 18 are remarkable for their limited range, all of which peaked out low in comparison to the remainder of the groups tested.

The group means vary from a low of 4.2 for Camp Cuyamaca on August 22 to a high of 11.6 for Valley of the Moon on July 24. The mean for the entire sample was 8.2.

Interpretation of these data is quite speculative in the absence of a standardized curriculum and instructional program across all camps. Also the fact that the instructional program itself does not adequately differentiate between students attending camp for the first time from those returning for the third or fourth season. Thus, the differences in performance may be attributable to emphasis given to certain terms and concepts at the various camps or to the previous exposure of students to these concepts at previous Outdoor Education camps. Another confounding factor is that students are not differentiated on the basis of grade level or language proficiency.

TABLE 4
STUDENT PERFORMANCE ON MASTERY TEST
(REPORTED BY CAMPSITE AND TEST DATES)

CAMPS	DATE(S)	N	RANGE	$\bar{x}$
Valley of the Moon	Cumulative	160	2 - 19	10.0
	July 16	85	2 - 18	9.0
	July 24	75	2 - 19	11.6
Cuyamaca	Cumulative	127	0 - 19	6.4
	June 22	25	1 - 12	6.9
	July 18	83	0 - 19	6.8
	August 22	19	1 - 10	4.2
Wastahi	Cumulative	222	0 - 18	6.3
	July 11	80	0 - 13	5.2
	July 18	90	0 - 13	6.0
	August 1	52	1 - 18	8.6
Sonora RLC	Cumulative	259	1 - 19	9.7
	June 20	73	1 - 17	9.3
	June 27	108	1 - 19	9.1
	July 11	78	1 - 19	10.8
Green Meadows	Cumulative	69	0 - 18	7.7
	July 31	48	0 - 18	8.9
	August 8	21	1 - 10	5.6
Camp Edwards	July 25	34	1 - 18	8.6
ENTIRE SAMPLE	Cumulative	837	0 - 19	8.2

Ancillary Data

An initial count of 938 completed tests were collected. After a preliminary review, a number were deemed incomplete and unusable for the purposes of this analysis. A total of 837 of the initial tests were thus used.

Of the 938 tests initially submitted, 315 (or 33.6%) were completed in Spanish and 623 (or 66.4%) were completed in English. This indicates that one-third of the students taking the mastery test were Spanish-dominant or at least preferred to take the test in Spanish. The sample size is also sufficiently large so as to permit the generalization of these data to the entire Outdoor Education program. If this assumption is correct, then the number of Spanish-dominant students participating in the program falls substantially below the rate anticipated by the evaluator.

A comparison of the performance levels between the Spanish-dominant and English-dominant was conducted. These data are reported on Table 5.

TABLE 5
CAMP CUYAMACA MASTERY TEST PERFORMANCE
(REPORTED BY DATES AND LANGUAGE GROUPS)

TEST DATE	CAMPWIDE		SPANISH		ENGLISH	
	N	$\bar{x}$	N	$\bar{x}$	N	$\bar{x}$
June 22	25	6.9	- 0 -	—	25	6.9
July 18	84	6.4	59	4.8	25	10.2
August 22	19	4.2	19	4.2	- 0 -	—
TOTALS	128	6.2	78	—	50	—

Camp Cuyamaca was chosen for this analysis because of the approximate balance between the amount of completed tests collected for both language groups, 78 Spanish and 50 English. These data also had a structure useful to this analysis. One test date yielded tests completed in English only; another yielded Spanish-only tests and a third date had both languages represented.

The July 18 test date shows that students who took the test in Spanish scored substantially below those students who took the test in English. In fact, the group mean for the English test group was over twice as great as the Spanish test group. Another perspective can be gained by contrasting the performance of the students on the test dates in which only one language was used. These data also indicated a better performance by the English-only group, with a group mean of 6.9 compared to a group mean of 4.2 by the Spanish-only group.

Again the previously stated problems in interpreting the test data hold; any number of factors may account for these performance levels. However, a pattern does emerge. The margin of performance between the Spanish and English tests is pronounced and cannot be ignored. It is conceivable that the Spanish-dominant students receive the majority of their instruction in English.

Recommendations

Perhaps the most salient implication of the findings discussed in this report is the need for a standardized program-wide curriculum and instructional

approach. It is a pre-condition of program-wide data. A corollary recommendation is the need for more systematic training of the instructional staff -- the mini-corpsmen-- particularly on the OBIS units.

Another recommendation is that students be grouped for instruction on the basis of language and prior participation in the Outdoor Education program. This would permit a more useful analysis of student achievement. Baseline data for these groupings should also be developed program-wide.

For the purpose of answering the program impact question, that is, whether the students' performance on the mastery tests can be attributed to the program itself, a statewide comparison group should be identified and tested.

Finally, the feasibility of utilizing a machine scannable test format and a computer for processing and analyzing the data on a weekly basis for each camp should be explored. This system would provide an enormous amount of valuable data to guide the management and instructional components of the program. Irrespective of the system used, greater responsibility for the testing program should be given to the camp coordinators. They should insure that tests and pencils are available at all camps, that test proctors are properly trained and that the test data is properly identified and transmitted to the central office for analysis. Another recommendation is that a full-time person at the central office monitor and coordinate the testing programs. A role comparable to the medi-corpsmen should be created so that a graduate-level staff person trained in evaluation techniques and procedures will facilitate the process.

APPENDIX B

TEST SPECIFICATIONS

TEST DESIGN MEMORANDA

This memoranda discusses the test specifications and measurement considerations that guided the design of the criterion - referenced test for the Outdoor Education Program. The basic concepts and corresponding vocabulary that are measured by the test are also listed.

TEST SPECIFICATIONS

This criterion-referenced test was designed to meet the following specifications:

General Specifications

subject: outdoor education, science
level : grades 4, 5, 6
language: Spanish and English
basic curriculum: Outdoor Biology Instructional
Strategies (OBIS)

Administration Specifications

type: single-session, group administered
format: pencil paper test; multiple choice,
matching and listing responses
item length: 30-40 items
duration: 20-25 minutes, maximum

Measurement Considerations

The nature of the Outdoor Education Program imposes several parameters that dictate the design and application of a test to assess the effectiveness of the instructional, learning activities. The major factors are:

- the participation of students that attended the program in previous years along with first-time participants
- the diversity of the learning environments, both in the composition of the instructional personnel and in the physical setting of the camps as well as the differences in instructional cycles at each camp from one week to the next
- the brief duration of the one-week instructional term to which the student participants are exposed

The measurement implications of these above - cited conditions are that:

- only those elements of the OBIS curriculum that all of the instructional sites (i.e. camps) share in common can be used

- the one-week elapse time of instructional program only permit an assessment of short-term learning/memory in a test designed to be administered at the instructional site

CONCEPTS AND VOCABULARY TESTED

A careful review of the OBIS curriculum conducted in consultation with Sid Tarango, produced a subset of the curriculum that is common to all instructional campsites throughout each weekly cycle. The following six instructional units comprise this subset of the curriculum:

- adaptation - animals
- litter critters
- food chains
- invent a plant
- invent an animal

Combined, these six units represent 30% of the total OBIS curriculum. A comparison of these units to the remaining ones revealed that the concepts introduced in the selected units are repeated in the remaining units to such an extent that approximately 50% of the basic concepts in the OBIS curriculum are contained in these six units.

The mastery test is thus designed to answer the question: What did the students learn? The question of how well they learned cannot be answered by this mastery test. To answer this latter question, a base line or comparison group needs to be incorporated into the evaluation design.

The following list identifies the basic concepts and vocabulary in the selected OBIS units. It is evident from this list that even among these units there is overlap in the concepts presented.

<u>Units</u>	<u>Concepts</u>	<u>Vocabulary</u>
adaptation-animals	adaptation predator devices habitats camouflage evidence	predators prey organism capture adapted
invent a plant	adaptation environments seasons photosynthesis	immobility surviving reproducing model inventing features suited

<u>Units</u>	<u>Concepts</u>	<u>Vocabulary</u>
invent an animal	habitat area predators adaptation camouflage	blend features surviving improves reproducing protective hiding surroundings avoid fable
litter critters	natural litters habitat environment decomposers	litters decaying layer constantly moist fungi bacteria twigs refuge minerals crevices capture search container scoop return discover abdomen thorax
food chains	populations survival balanced community organisms	feeding nature achieve sash stomach zones relationships link chain vary connected succeeding availability limits captive number distribution
seed dispersal	adaptation seed-dispersal mechanism survival	dispersal mechanism enable location burrs float burst

<u>Unit</u>	<u>Concepts</u>	<u>Vocabulary</u>
seed dispersal (continued)		split adapt modify parent attract tasty collect
		<u>general vocabulary</u> in pre-camp and enroute to camp activities:
		erosion climate reptile ecology chlorophyll deciduous plant

The attached test was developed to test a student's mastery of these concepts and an understanding of these terms.

TEST LEVELS

Two mastery tests were developed to assess the extent to which mini-corps students participating in the Outdoor Education program grasped the key concepts and vocabulary presented in the OBIS curriculum. FORM A is designed for administration to students in grades 4, 5, and 6. FORM B is designed for administration to junior high school students. Both of these tests were also developed in Spanish.

INTERPRETATION OF RESULTS

The results from administering these mastery tests to student participants of the outdoor education program answer the questions:

- what did the student learn?
- how much did the student learn?

However, due to the short duration of the course of instruction and test administration at the conclusion of the program, the test questions answered by these tests should be modified as follows:

- what did the students learn by the end of the program?
- how much did the students learn by the end of the program?

The test results should thus be interpreted with some caution since they only measure short-term recall. The test data do not support a generalization about long-term learning derived from the outdoor education program.

The question:

what was the impact of the outdoor education program on students?

requires a baseline for comparison. A sample of students comparable to the student participants of the outdoor education program would be required to answer this question.

PART 2.0

NUMBER OF MIGRANT PUPILS SERVED IN THE
OUTDOOR EDUCATION PROGRAM DURING SUMMER 1980

<u>TEAM LEADER</u>	<u>CAMP SITES</u>	<u>ESTIMATE NUMBER OF MIGRANT PUPILS SERVED</u>
Alex Fierros	Regional Learning Center Route 3, Box 530 Sonora, CA 95370	450
Juan Martinez	Green Meadows General Delivery Fish Camp, CA 93623 Sequoia Lake Redwood Camp Miramonte, CA 93641	800
Fernando Moreno	Camp Hypass Tierra Del Sol Road Boulevard, CA 92005 Camp Edwards Angelus Oaks, CA 92305 Camp Cuyamuca Star Route 1 Box 2600 Descanso, CA 92016	393
Juan Olivarría	Camp Wastahi P. O. Box 855 Felton, CA 95018 Camp Calamigos Route 4, 14A Malibu, CA 90265	425
Raul Ramirez	El Dorado National Forest Jackson, CA	344 (high school)
Frank Reveles	El Dorado National Forest Jackson, CA	344 (high school)
Manuel Sanchez	Valley of the Moon P.O. Box 307 Glen Ellen, CA 95442 Camp Cazadero 22175 King Ridge Road Cazadero, CA 95421 Lodestar Ranch Wilseyville, CA 95257	400

24

GRAND TOTAL

3,156

PART 3.0

TABLE SHOWING SUMMARY RATINGS OF OUTDOOR EDUCATION TEACHER ASSISTANTS PERFORMANCE
FOLLOWS:

ACTIVITIES	NUMBER	OUTSTANDING	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	DOES NOT APPLY
1. Understanding of migrant children and sensitivity to their needs.	32	56%	41%	3%		
2. Help provided to the teacher in understanding the needs of migrant children.	12	100%				
3. Understanding of his role and his relationship with the teacher in the classroom in the special handling of migrant pupils.	14	86%	14%			
4. Effectiveness in providing actual instruction in Spanish as needed.	32	59%	34%	6%	3%	
5. Effectiveness as an interpreter between teachers and Spanish-speaking children and parents.	20	55%	40%	5%		
6. Effectiveness in assisting with instruction in Mexican-American history and culture.	12	83%	8%	8%		
7. Effectiveness as a suitable role model for migrant children.	34	62%	32%	6%		
8. Effectiveness in assisting with follow up of absenteeism of migrant children.	11	82%	9%	9%		
9. Ability to manage and control small groups of children.	32	53%	25%	19%	3%	
10. Coordinates home visits and reports feedback to teacher.	4	50%	25%	25%		
11. Demonstrated ability to work cooperatively and harmoniously with peers and professional staff.	33	61%	30%		9%	
12. Decorum	30	70%	23%	7%		
13. Health and Vitality	33	58%	36%	6%		
14. Personal Appearance	33	67%	24%	9%		
15. Poise	33	61%	33%	3%	3%	

SUMMARY RATINGS OF OUTDOOR EDUCATION TEACHER ASSISTANTS PERFORMANCE - CONTINUED

<u>ACTIVITIES</u>	NUMBER	OUTSTANDING	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	DOES NOT APPLY
16. Voice and Speech	32	56%	31%	9%	3%	
17. Judgement	33	52%	36%	6%	6%	
18. Creativity	33	48%	39%	9%	3%	
19. Initiative	29	59%	34%	3%	3%	
20. Punctuality	31	68%	23%	10%		
21. Attendance	29	79%	17%	3%		
22. General rapport with and acceptance by pupils.	31	68%	23%	10%		
23. Enthusiasm	31	61%	35%	3%		
24. Sense of Humor	31	61%	32%	6%		
25. Dependability	31	74%	19%	6%		
26. Originality	31	58%	39%	3%		
27. Personal Integrity	31	71%	29%			
28. Respects attitudes and opinions of others.	31	74%	23%		3%	
29. Innovation	31	58%	32%	6%	3%	
30. Accepts constructive criticism and suggestions.	31	61%	29%	6%	3%	
31. Exhibits leadership potential	31	65%	32%	3%		
32. Oral and written expression in English.	32	41%	53%	6%		
33. Oral and written expression in Spanish.	32	44%	44%	13%		
34. Ability to motivate students.	31	48%	42%	6%	3%	
PART II: FOR USE <u>ONLY</u> WITH UPPER DIVISION AND EXPERIENCED MINI-CORPS TEACHER ASSISTANTS, ITEMS 32 THROUGH 52						
35. Demonstrated knowledge of techniques of teaching and working with migrant children.	14	79%	14%	7%		
36. Demonstrated knowledge of techniques of English as a Second Language.	5	100%				

SUMMARY RATINGS OF OUTDOOR EDUCATION TEACHER ASSISTANTS PERFORMANCE - CONTINUED

ACTIVITIES	NUMBER	OUTSTANDING	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	DOES NOT APPLY
37. Ability to bring forth an awareness of the educational program to the parents in the community.	8	63%	36%			
38. Interest and sincerity in providing ideas, opinions at Parent Advisory Meetings, Board Meetings, Teacher Meetings or other group activities.	7	86%	14%			
39. A general knowledge of subject matter(s) taught. List and note subject matter.						
<u>Math and Arithmetic</u>	5	40%	60%			
<u>Bilingual instruction including ESL</u>	5	40%	60%			
<u>Science</u>	9	56%	33%	11%		
<u>Social Science</u>	5	100%				
<u>Other</u>	11	55%	36%		9%	
40. Skill in lesson planning and organization.	14	50%	43%		7%	
41. Knowledge and use of teaching methods.	14	50%	43%		7%	
42. Demonstrated knowledge of techniques for consistent pupil control and classroom management.	13	54%	31%	15%		
43. Knowledge of commonly used standardized tests and published norms and ability to interpret these instruments.	6		83%		16%	
44. Professional attitude toward cooperating teacher.	11	82%	9%		9%	
45. Knowledge of and operation of media equipment.	6	100%				
46. Ability to construct and utilize instructional materials for non-English-speaking students.	10	70%	30%			
47. Ability to diagnose learning needs of pupils.	8	63%	13%	25%		
48. Ability to prescribe individualized instruction.	8	63%	25%	12%		
49. Competency to instruct reading and oral language development programs.	5	100%				
50. I believe this person has the following potential as a teacher: (N = 15)						
<u>80%</u> Outstanding						
<u>13%</u> Above Average						
<u> </u> Average						
<u> </u> Below Average						
<u>7%</u> Should be encouraged to consider another profession						

SEVEN TEAM LEADERS RATED BY 37 TEACHER ASSISTANTS
(AVERAGE RATINGS)

RESPONSE CODE:	SA A	STRONGLY AGREE	N D	NEITHER AGREE OR DISAGREE	SD NA	STRONGLY DISAGREE DOES NOT APPLY
	SA	A	N	D	SD	NA
1. I have become more competent due to my experience in Mini-Corps this summer.	75%	19%	3%			3%
2. I have increased my overall knowledge of migrant children and their families.	46%	46%	8%			
3. I feel challenged professionally by my work with Mini-Corps.	69%	25%	6%			
4. The Team Leader presented useful inservice programs.	26%	24%	16%	5%	11%	18%
5. The Team Leader attempts to cover too much in one service workshop.	5%	5%	22%	30%	14%	24%
6. The Team Leader encourages students to express opinions.	41%	30%	8%	3%	19%	
7. The Team Leader encourages group discussions.	46%	24%	5%	5%	16%	3%
8. The Team Leader is receptive to new ideas and other's viewpoints.	43%	24%	5%	8%	19%	
9. The Team Leader has the inservice training program well organized.	24%	27%	16%	5%	11%	16%
10. The Team Leader's directions are easy to understand.	35%	41%	5%	5%	14%	
11. The Team Leader provides us with good ideas to use in our field work with migrant children.	41%	30%	8%	8%	11%	3%
12. The Team Leader seems to enjoy his position and other duties related to coordinating of our local Mini-Corps program.	57%	24%	8%	3%	8%	
13. I received adequate career counseling from the Team Leader.	29%	20%	17%	11%	11%	11%
14. The Team Leader is a dynamic and energetic person.	46%	14%	24%	3%	11%	3%
15. The Team Leader is enthusiastic about the Mini-Corps program.	43%	38%	11%	5%	3%	
16. I genuinely helped increase the academic proficiency of migrant pupils with whom I worked.	39%	53%	8%			
17. My classroom experience was appropriate and rewarding.	67%	25%				8%
18. I felt the Team Leader visited and supervised me adequately this summer.	49%	22%	3%	8%	14%	5%
19. I rate this Team Leader as follows:	E	G	F	NI	P	--
	47%	17%	11%	14%	11%	--

E=Excellent G=Good F=Fair NI=Needs Improvement P=Poor

RATINGS FOR LOWEST RATED TEAM LEADER
(1 TEAM LEADER RATED BY 11 TEACHER ASSISTANTS)

RESPONSE CODE:	SA A	STRONGLY AGREE	N D	NEITHER AGREE OR DISAGREE	SD NA	STRONGLY DISAGREE DOES NOT APPLY
	SA	A	N	D	SD	NA
1. I have become more competent due to my experience in Mini-Corps this summer.	91%	9%				
2. I have increased my overall knowledge of migrant children and their families.	73%	18%	9%			
3. I feel challenged professionally by my work with Mini-Corps.	64%	36%				
4. The Team Leader presented useful inservice programs.		18%	27%	9%	36%	9%
5. The Team Leader attempts to cover too much in one service workshop.			20%	30%	10%	40%
6. The Team Leader encourages students to express opinions.		18%	9%	9%	64%	
7. The Team Leader encourages group discussions.		9%	9%	18%	55%	9%
8. The Team Leader is receptive to new ideas and other's viewpoints.		9%		27%	64%	
9. The Team Leader has the inservice training program well organized.		9%	18%	18%	36%	18%
10. The Team Leader's directions are easy to understand.		27%	9%	18%	45%	
11. The Team Leader provides us with good ideas to use in our field work with migrant children.		18%	18%	18%	36%	9%
12. The Team Leader seems to enjoy his position and other duties related to coordinating of our local Mini-Corps program.	9%	36%	18%		36%	
13. I received adequate career counseling from the Team Leader.			36%	27%	27%	9%
14. The Team Leader is a dynamic and energetic person.			36%	18%	36%	9%
15. The Team Leader is enthusiastic about the Mini-Corps program.		45%	27%	18%	9%	
16. I genuinely helped increase the academic proficiency of migrant pupils with whom I worked.	27%	73%				
17. My classroom experience was appropriate and rewarding.	36%	27%				27%
18. I felt the Team Leader visited and supervised me adequately this summer.		27%		18%	36%	18%
19. I rate this Team Leader as follows:	E	G	F	NI	P	--
			9%	45%	45%	

E=Excellent G=Good F=Fair NI=Needs Improvement

PART 5.0

SUMMER EVALUATION REPORT FROM
OUTDOOR EDUCATION MINI-CORPS STUDENTS

1. On average did your Team Leader supervise you: (check one)
 Less than once a week? _____ Once a week? 19
 (If your Team Leader supervised you less than once a week, record here how often: More than once a week: 7)
2. Please complete the following ratings to summarize your satisfaction with the Mini-Corps program during the past summer.

TABLE OF RATINGS OF OVERALL PROGRAM FACTORS BY 26 TEACHER ASSISTANTS BY PERCENT

FACTORS TO BE EVALUATED	EXCELLENT	GOOD	FAIR	POOR
1. The quality of my Outdoor Education experience.	77	23		
2. The supervision I received from my Team Leader.	58	31	12	
3. The overall quality of the <u>inservice</u> training I received this summer.	30	39	22	9
4. The quality of my Outdoor Education experience in preparing me to teach migrant children.	64	32	4	
5. Communications with statewide Mini-Corps Headquarters.	8	32	32	28
6. The overall quality of the preservice training I received at Redwood Glen.	44	39	6	11
7. The overall quality of the preservice training I received at El Dorado (Wilderness/Survival).	64	32		5
8. How would you rate your Mini-Corps program experience to prospective Mini-Corpspersons?	67	33		
9. Communication with Migrant Education Regional Personnel.	17	28	44	11